

Application No.: 09/937,622

Docket No.: 21900-00037-US

**REMARKS**

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been considered.

Claims 1 to 8 stand rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Timm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,204). The invention is directed to the combination of an emergency communication system and a simplified navigation system as compared with the prior art.

Timm includes a complete GPS receiver as part of the emergency system. Typically, such GPS systems rely on satellite signals to derive vehicle position. However, they also typically rely on Gyro sensors included in a navigation system to accurately determine vehicle heading which is necessary to accurately detect changes in directions. This is suggested in Col 3, line 61-Col 4, line 13.

The emergency communication system 1 of the claimed invention includes a GPS receiver/antenna and gyro sensor, and these components provide data to a separate external navigation system 4 which requires advancing direction information and present position information to display position to a driver. Due to the inclusion of GPS and gyro components in the emergency communication system 1 there is no need to include these components in the external navigation system and this greatly simplifies the structure of the navigation system as explained in detail in the specification (e.g. pages 1-4).

Timm et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of a separate emergency system (with GPS and gyro) and an external navigation system without these components. To further clarify the present invention and to further distinguish it from the prior art, the claims have been appropriately amended.

Anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every limitation as set forth in the claims. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 USPQ2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Alkzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986). There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection

Application No.: 09/937,622

Docket No.: 21900-00037-US

under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genetech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH v. Dart Industries*, 220 USPQ 841 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 21900-00037-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 2, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Morris Liss

Registration No.: 24,510  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-3425  
(202) 331-7111  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant